



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,914	06/04/2004	Peter L. Soracco	PU2219	3913

23454 7590 05/08/2006
CALLAWAY GOLF COMPANY
2180 RUTHERFORD ROAD
CARLSBAD, CA 92008-7328

EXAMINER

PASSANITI, SEBASTIANO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3711

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/709,914	Applicant(s) SORACCO ET AL.	
	Examiner Sebastiano Passaniti	Art Unit 3711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on see detailed Office action.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/02/2005</u> . | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Sample T/D and \$3.73</u> . |

Art Unit: 3711

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is responsive to communication received 06/04/2004 – application papers filed; 09/24/2004 – Response to Notice to File Missing Parts and Oath; 03/02/2005 – IDS; 06/01/2005 – Status Inquiry.

Claims 1-38 are pending.

Following is an action on the MERITS:

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract exceeds 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 3711

Claims 1-38 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8, 10-15, 17-28, 30-39 and 41-45 of copending Application No. 10/709,247 in view of Mader (U.S. Patent No. 4,021,047). This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. The claimed device of the '247 application lacks an aft-body fashioned from non-metallic materials as well as a recitation of an exterior surface area expressed as a specific percentage of the total exterior surface area of the golf club head. Moreover, the '247 application is not specific as to the exterior surface area of the face (instant claim 8). Mader shows it to be old in the art to fabricate a club head with a metallic face and a non-metallic rear portion, or aft-body. See column 1, line 60 through column 2, line 26 in Mader. Here, Mader uses this combination of materials to promote solid feel on contact of a golf ball with the head. See column 1, lines 20-30 in Mader. In view of the patent to Mader, it would have been obvious to modify the claimed invention of the '247 application to include a non-metallic aft-body in combination with the already provided metallic face, the motivation being to provide a good solid feel to the club head. As for the specific, claimed percentages of surface are for both the aft-body and the face, note that the Mader patent obviates the inclusion of an aft-body that occupies between 27% and 75% of the total exterior surface area of the club head and further would appear to obviate the inclusion of a face component, wherein the exterior surface area of the face component ranges from 15 square inches to 25 square inches.

Art Unit: 3711

As to the remaining limitations in the instant claims, note the following comparisons between the limitations found in the instant claims and the limitations found in the claims of the '247 application:

As to instant claim 1, see claims 1 and 2 of the '247 application;

As to instant claims 2, 3 and 4, see the arguments, supra;

As to instant claim 5, see claims 4 and 12 of the '247 application;

As to instant claim 6, see claim 8 of the '247 application;

As to instant claim 7, see claims 7, 15 and 28 of the '247 application;

As to instant claim 8, see the arguments, supra;

As to instant claim 9, see claims 1, 17 and 30 of the '247 application;

As to instant claim 10, see claims 1 and 2 of the '247 application;

As to instant claims 11, 12, 13 and 14, see the arguments, supra;

As to instant claim 15, see claims 7, 15 and 28 of the '247 application;

As to instant claim 16, see claims 10, 25 and 38 of the '247 application;

As to instant claim 17, see claims 1, 17 and 30 of the '247 application;

As to instant claim 18, see claim 8 of the '247 application;

As to instant claims 19-24, see claims 19-24, respectively, of the '247 application;

As to instant claim 25, see claims 1 and 19 of the '247 application;

As to instant claims 26-28, see the arguments, supra;

As to instant claim 29, see claims 4 and 12 of the '247 application;

As to instant claim 30, see claims 10, 25 and 38 of the '247 application;

As to instant claims 31 and 32, see the arguments, supra;

Art Unit: 3711

As to instant claim 33, see claims 4 and 12 of the '247 application;

As to instant claims 35-38, see claims 21-24, respectively, of the '247 application.

Terminal Disclaimer

Enclosed with this Office action is a sample terminal disclaimer, which is effective to overcome a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection over a pending application (37 CFR 1.321(b) and (c)).

Also enclosed is a sample Statement Under 37 CFR 3.73(b) (Form PTO/SB/96) which an assignee may use in order to ensure compliance with the rule. Part A of the Statement is used when there is a single assignment from the inventor(s). Part B of the Statement is used when there is a chain of title. The "Copies of assignments..." box should be checked when the assignment document(s) (set forth in part A or part B) is/are not recorded in the Office, and a copy of the assignment document(s) is/are attached. When the "Copies of assignments..." box is checked, either the part A box or the part B box, as appropriate, must be checked, and the "Reel_____, Frame_____" entries should be left blank. If the part B box is checked, and copies of assignments are not included, the "From:_____ To:_____" blank(s) must be filled in. This statement should be used the first time an assignee seeks to take action in an application under 37 CFR 3.73(b), e.g., when signing a terminal disclaimer or a power of attorney.

Art Unit: 3711


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sebastiano Passaniti whose telephone number is 571-272-4413. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (6:30AM - 3:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eugene L. Kim can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S.Passaniti/sp
April 24, 2006


Sebastiano Passaniti
Primary Examiner